

**EETT Grant Competition 2005-2006 Application****FORM 1 - Cover Sheet**

Grant Category: (Please select one.)

☒ Professional Development for Student Achievement☐ Technical Support for Student Achievement InitiativesGrant amount requested: \$ 418,460

LEA participants and percentage of money to be received from the grant:

LEA (District)	Contact Name	Contact E-mail	% to be received
Juab School District	Kirk Wright	kirk.wright@juab.k12.ut.us	17.31 %
North Sanpete School District	Courtney Syme	courtney.syme@ns.k12.ut.us	17.31 %
Piute School District	Lewis Mullins	lewis.mullins@piute.k12.ut.us	9.62 %
Sevier School District	Brent Thorne	brent.thorne@sevier.k12.ut.us	25 %
South Sanpete School District	James Petersen	james.petesen@ss.k2.ut.us	15.38 %
Tintic School District	Ronald Barlow	ron.Barlow@tintic.k12.ut.us	9.62 %
Wayne School district	Jesse Pace	jesse.pace@wayne.k1.ut.us	9.62%

Other partners and percentage of money to be received from the grant:

Other Partners	Contact Name	Contact E-mail	% to be received
Central Utah Correctional Facility	Doug Ludvigson		1.9%
Jordan School District	TBA		0%

Note: percentages should total 100%

Percent of requested funds designated for professional development: 62%

Assurance that indirect costs (if taken from grant award) will conform to regulations: (Please select one.)

☒ YES☐ NO

Assurance that all LEAs receiving funds from this grant have a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology as demonstrated by their agreement to not transfer any formula Title II Part D funds out of their district's Title II Part D budget: (Please select one.)

☒ YES☐ NO

Fiscal LEA Superintendent signature:

\_\_\_\_\_

Project/Grant Manager signature:

\_\_\_\_\_

**FORM 2 - Project Summary** (up to two pages) *Write a brief overview of the project detailing how your proposal meets the goals and purposes of this grant competition. Include your project goals, timeline overview, and success measures.*

We envision a school where an administrator utilizes technology through frequent, non-formal classroom visits. The data gathered will be combined to give an overall picture of the teaching practices. This combined with formative student achievement data will be used to consult with the teacher on academic deficiencies of their students and provide differentiated instructional strategies to increase student achievement.

Today's instructional leader needs additional knowledge and tools in order to do the job under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) guidelines. This grant will provide school leaders with the needed technology tools, the support, and the skills to help teachers focus on essential instruction. The goals of the project are identical to the goals of the grant application. Specifically, the goals are (1) to improve academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools, (2) assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – to increase his or her academic achievement through becoming technologically literate, and (3) encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum enhancement to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

Research literature clearly states that in order to make a difference, leadership is the single most important factor affecting the successful integration of technology into schools (Anderson, School Technology: Incident and Impact). Please note additional research within the project detail. This project will partner the leaders of seven rural school districts; including 47 schools, two regional centers, a Utah Correctional facility, an urban school district, and one college; to provide school leaders the skills and tools needed to positively impact student achievement by leading teachers to make data-driven decisions for day-to-day instruction on the Utah Core Curriculum and by coaching teachers in the use of research based instructional practices. Specifically Central Utah Educational Services (CUES), a regional service center, will provide training on the Data-Driven-Decision-Making model, follow-up training on the use of the Walk'bout software, training on a data-disaggregation system, and in the instructional process. Southeast Educational Service Center (SESC), another regional center, will provide technical support and the expertise to tweak the Utah Testing Item Pool Server (UTIPS) to meet the needs of school personnel and students using the data-driven instructional model. Snow College Richfield Campus will provide programming expertise for the web-based interfaces for UTIPS. Initial training on the Walk'bout software will be provided by a consultant, which includes visits to sites that are successfully using the knowledge on which the software is based. District sponsored professional development will be leveraged by inviting all stake-holders (personnel and students) who are members of the consortium to attend pertinent activities.

Goal	Date	Activity	Success Measure
Improve academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools	5/05	Provide Leaders with book "Classroom Instruction that Works"	Leaders gain knowledge – Differentiated Instruction
	6/05	Palm Training	Leaders refine knowledge – Differentiated Instruction Take accurate data on Palm using Walk'bout software
	7/05	Vision Development	
		Review "Classroom Instruction that Works"	
		Walk'bout Training	
	8/05	UTIPS Training	UTIPS provides timely data for differentiated instruction
	9/05	Leaders visit schools successfully using Walk'bout	Refine skills of using laptops and increase knowledge to differentiate instruction
	6/06	Remediation Strategies for identified power standards	Leaders know where to find and implement strategies
	4/07	Training on newly developed data disaggregation tool for reporting	Leaders will successfully disaggregate student data for their school and produce NCLB reports

Goal	Date	Activity	Success Measure
Assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – to increase his or her academic achievement through becoming technologically literate	7/05	Review “Classroom Instruction that Works”	Students observed using talking text, digital text, Word features, enhanced text, graphic organizers, portable devices
	8/05	UTIPS Training	Allows students to receive focused, appropriate instruction
Encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum enhancement to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.	10/05	Data-Driven-Decision-Making	Leader follows <u>Center for Performance Assessment</u> six step strategies for Data-Driven-Decision-Making
	11/05	Implement Marzano Strategies	Leader identifies when teacher is using the following: <i>Identifying similar and different</i> <i>Homework and Practice</i> <i>Setting Objectives/provide feedback</i> <i>Representing Knowledge</i> <i>Generate &amp; test hypothesis</i> <i>Summarizing and note taking</i> <i>Cues, Question, Advance Organizer</i> <i>Reinforce effort/provide recognition</i> <i>Learning Groups</i>
	12/05	Evaluation visits to each school	Feedback received by each leader relating to project progress – mentoring offered to leader
	1/05	Leaders visit school using Data-Driven-Decision-Making to differentiate instruction	Leaders will duplicate techniques and systems of Data-Driven-Decision-Making which leads to differentiated instruction in their own schools
	monthly meeting 11/05 – 5/07	Online Cohort Meetings (skip summer months)	Ideas, successes, and failures will be shared in order to continually improve classroom instruction
	4/06	Review of disaggregated data before NCLB testing	Leaders will identify areas needed to be strengthened and follow through on needed instructional strategies
	5/06	Cohorts visit each others schools	Celebrate successes and strengthen weaknesses
	10/06	Data Disaggregation Instruction	Leader categorizes data from students into mastered and non-mastered skills and plans for differentiated instruction
	12/06	Evaluation visits to each school	Feedback received by each leader relating to project progress – mentoring offered to leader
	1/07	Leaders visit school using Data-Driven-Decision-Making to differentiate instruction	Leaders will duplicate techniques and systems of Data-Driven-Decision-Making leading to differentiated instruction in their own schools
	5/07 7/07	Review and Share successes Publish Project Findings and Successes at Utah Rural School Conference, NECC, UCET	Celebrate success of project

### FORM 3 - Project Detail (up to eight pages)

**District Needs:** Articulate the district needs, capacity, sustainability, and impact of this project.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has required the districts to be more cognizant of student data and how it drives student achievement. The requirements of NCLB are such that student progress in subgroups such as ethnicity, gender, special education, and poverty need to be carefully analyzed for the students to achieve the desired goals. This is a desirable goal but a daunting task. Instructional leaders in our schools need additional knowledge and additional tools to do the job.

In order to help our instructional leaders gain this additional knowledge, their needs will be met in the following areas: First; the need of data gathering will be approached. Utah Test Item Pool Server (UTIPS) generates test questions correlated with the Utah State Core Curriculum. After the student takes a system generated sample test the system allows teachers to use five different reports to evaluate student performance. It also allows teachers to generate their own tests using their own specific questions with the same five tools. Another data gathering tool we will be using is the Walk'bout. The Walk'bout is both a protocol for conducting short classroom visitations (2 to 3 minute) and a database for aggregating the information gathered. The purpose of the protocol is to gain objective information regarding the implementation of school-wide goals related to effective instructional practices, depth of knowledge levels of student activities, and alignment of instruction to the Utah Content Standards. The Walk'bout data is gathered with the use of a personal digital assistant (like a Palm). The software compiles the information instantly to create reports of individual visits and/or school, grade, course, or subject level degrees of implementation. This tool allows the school leader to observe the percent of students on task, the specific student activity, the knowledge level of the student activity, the instructional mode, the teacher activity, the predominate effective practice being used, the methods for checking for understanding, and the type of differentiated instruction. The data is then "hot-synched" to a laptop computer where reports can be generated. Once the data is entered, a menu of reports is available. Reports of a single classroom visit can be created or a number of observations can be combined into a single report. The purpose of the protocol is for school leadership to analyze mission-critical data related to classroom instruction. Student activities are calibrated to Utah Core Curriculum Standards. The information can be used for the implementation of grade level, department level, or even school wide goals. This is objective data regarding teacher practices that can drive effective instruction and is a means for continuous school improvement.

Second; the need of data analysis will be taught. Critical data is currently available such as criterion references test, Utah Basic Skill Inventory (UBSCT) (Grad 10), and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (Grades 3, 5 and 8) and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (Grade 11). However, this data is not timely nor is it used as effectively as it could be. In order to make a difference, elementary and secondary Administrators need training and the technology tools to effectively lead classroom teachers to implement "Data-Driven-Decision-Making." Administrators need training to use data to guide teachers to focus instruction on essential curriculum. They will be introduced to the Making Standards Work process, which treats the essential curriculum as the "Safety Net Curriculum." This is a means to help teachers identify the critical elements to be taught. The Safety Net provides school leaders and teachers with broad discretion on teaching and curriculum provided that the students have achieved the Safety Net objectives. School leaders need training in the Data-Driven-Decision-Making model. Administrators will lead teachers in gathering data and analyzing it to determine the needs of specific students and prioritize what is to be taught. Goals need to be set and refined to focus on student achievement, and then specific research proven instructional strategies will be implemented. Mastery indicators will be set for each power standard. CRT and end-of-level test scores and other high stakes tests will be entered into the disaggregation system. However, additional, more-timely data will be made available from the Utah Test Item Pool Server, Yearly Progress Pro, and teacher generated tests such as the Texas Primary Reading Inventory, Writing Assessments, the Diagnostic Reading Assessment, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy and, the Woodcock Johnson 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Administrators will have better access to useful data, and they will be able to disaggregate the data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of different groups or individual students. Administrators will have the tools and skills needed to establish a protocol to guide teachers to make appropriate decisions concerning the priority of what needs to be taught, to whom, and when. The power standards will be taught to all students in each sub-group. Additionally, there will be a process to identify and fill any curriculum gaps.

Third; the need of applying correct instructional strategies will be broached. Power standards need to be identified, data gathered and analyzed, and appropriate instruction implemented to provide the teachers clarity and focus to augment student achievement. Not all students learn in the same way or at the same rate. Teachers can use technology

as a tool to deliver differentiated instruction to students. School leaders will have the knowledge and skills to show teachers ways to use technology as an effective integration strategy. Examples for using technology for differentiated instruction such as talking text, digital text, word features, enhanced text, graphic organizers, and portable devices are given by the Regional Technology in Education Consortium [http://rtecexchange.edgateway.net/cs/rtec/view/rtec\\_str/11](http://rtecexchange.edgateway.net/cs/rtec/view/rtec_str/11). A consultant will present the initial workshop to the Administrators. The CUES Technology Training staff will provide follow-up training to both Administrators and teachers in the schools. School leaders will meet with teacher teams to focus finding “treasures” in the data. Administrators will be supported as they work to become comfortable with new ways of doing business. They will lead the teachers in the school and become instructional managers. Administrators will acquire the additional tools and knowledge needed in order to fulfill their roles as the instructional leaders in the schools. Administrators throughout the region will meet with groups of teachers in their schools and use the tools and data as a catalyst for greater student achievement.

Instructional leaders will progress through this process during the next two years. The capacity of grant partners to meet the above needs and to sustain the changes that meet these needs is outlined in the table below:

Partners	Capacity	Sustainability
CUES	Data-Specialist Technology Trainer Technology Specialist Data-Driven Specialist	Ongoing: (pending state funding) Ongoing: state funded Ongoing: state funded Ongoing: state funded
Districts (7)	Cohort Human Resource Collaboration PolyCom - <i>IP based communication system</i> Partner in Disaggregation System District level tech support Curriculum Specialists Professional Development Collaboration	Ongoing: district funded Ongoing: owned by districts Ongoing: district funded Ongoing: district and state funded Ongoing: district funded Ongoing: district funded Ongoing: district funded
Snow College Richfield	Programming expertise for web-interface etc. Consultation	Contracted for year one
SESC	UTIPS Training	Ongoing: State funded

**Research-base:** Articulate how the project is based on high quality research and will improve student academic achievement.

A consortium of more than a dozen groups released Technology Standards for School Administrators at a meeting of the National Schools Boards Association. The six standards closely fit the intent and goals of our project. Our project will teach school leaders the concepts skills outlined by these standards. The Six standards are: 1. Leadership and Vision 2. Learning and Teaching 3. Productivity and Professional Practice 4. Support, Management and Operations 5. Assessment and Evaluation and 6. Social, Legal and Ethical Issues. [http://www.educationworld.com/a\\_admin/admin247.shtml](http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin247.shtml) (Article by Gary Hopkins Education World ©Copyright 2001,2002 Education World).

After clearly defining the core beliefs about educational technology that guide the work of state technology directors, members of the Technology Leadership Skills for the 21st Century Work Group focused on creating a clear set of standards delineating key attributes of an effective technology leader. These standards fit well with an instructional leader at the school level. Specifically, Standard III - Teaching, Learning and the Curriculum and Standard IV - Assessment and Evaluation will be implemented in this project. <http://www.setda.org/Toolkit2003/tls/tls1.htm>

The table below indicates further ties of this project to quality research:

Quality Research	Activities to Improve Academic Achievement
<p>Because technology is credited as being a significant factor in increasing productivity in many industries, some people believe that more effective use of technology in schools could do more to improve educational opportunities and quality. Research indicates that while there are poor uses of technology in education, appropriate technology use can be very beneficial in increasing educational productivity (Byrom &amp; Bingham, 2001; Clements &amp; Sarama, 2003; Mann, Shakeshaft, Becker, &amp; Kottkamp, 1999; Valdez, McNabb, Foertsch, Anderson, Hawkes, &amp; Raack, 2000; Wenglinsky, 1998)." Critical Issue: Technology Leadership: Enhancing Positive Educational Change Gilbert Valdez PhD North Central Regional Laboratory Posted July 2004.</p>	<p>Take accurate data on Palm using Walk'bout software UTIPS provides timely data for differentiated instruction Refine skills of using software and increase knowledge to differentiate instruction</p>
<p>"The most effective way school administrators can promote technology use is to themselves be knowledgeable and effective users of technology," says Betty Kirstler, a computer technology coordinator at Tuckahoe School in South Hampton, New York." ... "Administrators need to model, model, model," stresses Marcia Reed, media center coordinator at St. Pius X School in Toledo, Ohio. "They can do that by using technology for administrative functions and by knowing how to use the hardware and software they expect teachers to use." Article by Linda Starr Education World® Copyright © 2001 Education World</p>	<p>Leader identifies when teacher is using the following by inputting observation data into PDA by using Walk'bout software: <i>Identifying similar and different</i> <i>Homework and Practice</i> <i>Setting Objectives/provide feedback</i> <i>Representing Knowledge</i> <i>Generate &amp; test hypothesis</i> <i>Summarizing and note taking</i> <i>Cues, Question, Advance Organizer</i> <i>Reinforce effort/provide recognition</i> <i>Learning Groups</i></p>
<p>The National Center for Education Statistics (2000) indicates that Administrator leadership has been described as one of the most important factors affecting the effective use of technology in classrooms. Additionally, Administrators who exhibit leadership are instrumental in modeling the use of technology in classrooms. They understand how technology can support best practices in instruction and assessment, and they provide teachers with guidance. In a study of three schools identified as successful integrators of technology, Wilburg (1991) found in all three cases, the administrator was a strong advocate and user of computer technology. This seems to support the notion that administrative modeling may be one key to integrating technology. Leadership for Technology Integration: The Role of Administrators and Mentors Educational Technology and Society by Tanna Kincaid and Lisa Felder 5(1) 2002</p>	<p>Refine skills of using laptops and increase knowledge to differentiate instruction Leaders know where to find and implement strategies Leaders will successfully disaggregate student data for their school and produce NCLB reports</p>

**Professional Development:** Articulate the professional development activities; how they align with the Utah Staff Development Guidelines, and the level of integration with district professional development activities.

In order to assess the professional development needs of regional administrators, a survey was formulated. After reviewing the results of the survey, the top three needs were identified as (1) differentiated instructional practices-93%, (2) student achievement data analysis-93%, and (3) student achievement data gathering-78%.

To fulfill need (1), leaders will receive instruction on differentiated instructional practices contained in the book Classroom Instruction that Works. To fulfill need (2), leaders will receive instruction on Data-Driven-Decision-Making, how to use UTIPS reporting and disaggregation tool, and how to use Walk'bout software reporting. To fulfill need (3), leaders will receive instruction in using UTIPS and Walk'bout Palm software.

This project organizes school administrators into learning communities, with the purpose of increasing student achievement, by encouraging continuous instructional improvement through collaboration, inservice, and accountability. The project will provide equipment, time and resources needed for improvement of student learning,

Participants in the project will implement the Data-Driven-Decision-Making Model to focus instruction and to sustain student improvement. The project will be evaluated using the NCLB benchmarks, UPASS standards and formative assessments as needed. The project includes a third party evaluation and places emphasis on accountability for students and educational professionals.

The project encourages learning with Administrators collaborating with teachers to enhance instruction from a menu of proven strategies. Knowledgeable Administrators will provide a positive influence on both teachers and students regarding teaching and learning through the use of technology. The collegial network will build the development of all participants and the educational family of each participating school.

All students in the participating schools will be held to high expectations and will be presented with developmentally appropriate instruction. Participants will use varied assessments and teaching strategies to enhance instruction and student achievement. The power standards taught will encourage student independence and self-learning. The project also encourages interaction and collaboration as a learning tool.

The National Education Technology Plan released by the United States Department of Education strongly encourages schools to strengthen leadership. "For public education to benefit from the rapidly evolving development of information and communication technology, leaders at every level (school, district, and state) must not only supervise, but provide informed, creative, and ultimately transformative leadership for systemic change." "Invest in leadership development programs to develop a new generation of tech-savvy leaders at every level."

<http://www.nationaledtechplan.org/actionsteps.asp#leadership>

The paper titled, *A Retrospective on Twenty Years of Educational Technology* by Katie Mcmillan Culp, Mararet Honey, and Ellen Mandianach (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology, 2003, page 13) gives the following recommendations:

- Improve the preparation of new teachers, including their knowledge of how to use technology for effective teaching and learning;
- Increase the quantity, quality, and coherence of technology-focused activities aimed at the professional development of teachers; and
- Improve real-time instructional support available to teachers who use technology."

Professional development focused on these concepts are appropriate for teachers however, we feel that inservice on these topics is also critical for school leaders. The project closely adheres to the Utah Educator Professional Development Guidelines *to provide professional development that improves the learning of all students.*

## Context Standards

The project

- forms region-wide cohort groups of Administrators into learning communities
- enhances the skills of building administrators to guide continuous instructional improvement
- provides school time, financial and in-kind support for adult learning and collaboration for school leaders. 62 Percent of the Budget is appropriated for Professional development

## Process Standards

The project

- is based on a research proven data-driven model to improve instruction
- uses research proven instructional models such as 6-trait writing, the Big 6
- encourages the use of appropriate learning strategies for all ages, ability levels and grade level of students
- creates cohort teams of administrators and encourages collaboration
- teaches skills and vision of a data-driven system and provides the technology tools needed for implementation
- encourages the change process in leading teachers to increase student achievement by using technology to enhance data-driven instruction

## Content Standards

The project:

- holds high expectations for student academic achievement in all NCLB sub-categories
- encourages an equitable and quality education for all students
- encourages developmentally appropriate instruction for all students based on core based power standards and objectives

**Action plan:** Detail the main project activities including staffing, professional development resources and schedules, facilities, timeframes, and hardware deployment. Include details on the data points you will collect to inform grant decisions (e.g. focus groups, CRT scores, teacher surveys, classroom observations, participant interviews, etc.)

**Data-Driven-Decision-Making:** Participants will be taught the Data-Driven-Decision-Making approach, from Center for Performance Assessment, to effectively use data to drive the instructional process. NCLB and Utah, initiated school improvement movements such as Performance Plus that have increased the amount of “high stakes” student achievement data available to teachers and school administrators. This project shows school leaders how to supplement the state test by using local assessments that provide achievement data that is timely and clearly focused on power standards. “These local assessments can be given during the course of the school year so that teachers pinpoint their students’ academic strengths and weaknesses in a timely manner and can intervene quickly. This rich set of diagnostic information on the achievement of each student can be organized into a database that provides teachers and school administrators detailed information on which students need additional assistance.” (*How States Can Use Information Technology to Support School Improvement Under NCLB* Chrys Dougherty, Ph.D. Director of Research, National Center for Educational Accountability.)

**Walk’bout Training:** School leadership will learn to collect and analyze data related to the instruction being delivered in the classrooms. Student activities recorded on the Walk’bout are calibrated to Utah Core Curriculum Standards. Leaders can work with the teachers and use the data to implement instructional goals for school improvement. The school leaders will spend time in the classrooms of the school using the Walk’bout application and will have data to analyze and share with the teachers regarding effective instructional practices being used in the classroom. The information will provide data to help the instructional teams focus on the most successful use of effective instructional strategies.

School leaders can enter a classroom to observe and quickly indicate the percent of students on task by checking one of the following: all, most, some, few or none. The Administrator also records depth of knowledge of the student activity. (e.g.) recall level, skill/concept level, strategic thinking, or extended thinking level. The predominate effective practice is also recorded. Effective instructional strategies for the Walk’bout are based on those from the research led by Robert Marzano at McREL. These strategies are summarized in [Classroom Instruction that Works](#) (ASCD). Predominate effective practice strategies include; identifying similarities and differences, homework and practice, setting objectives/providing feedback, representing knowledge, generating and testing hypotheses, summarizing and note taking, cues – questions and advance organizer, reinforcing effort/providing recognition and learning groups. The list can be modified to show school or district priorities.

The Administrator observes the instructional mode being applied by the teacher and records whether it is individual, small group or whole class instruction. The specific teacher activity is recorded noting direct instruction/whole group, direct instruction with small group, individual instruction, monitoring or providing feedback, lecturing, or leading discussion. If a teacher is using a video, giving a test, at their desk or computer, attending to miscellaneous needs, or is monitoring transitions, this can be recorded. The observer can also record if the instruction has been differentiated by learning style, achievement level, or both.

**Effective Instruction:** Research indicates that one of the highest factors influencing student achievement is the instructor. District and school level administrators who have the tools and skills to lead teachers to understand and implement effective instructional practices can have high impact on student achievement. “In analysis of growth factors we can control, the instructor is the big dog.” (*Delivering on the Promise, The New Foundation Press Inc, Kennnewick, WA. 2004. Page 66.*)

Our project is designed to increase communication between school leaders and teachers. Talk is important. “Talk is the best cultural indicator of focus. Shifting administrator focus to classroom instruction is like a new coat of paint on an old house. The walls are still the same, but everything looks, smells, and feels different. After a while we started to



function differently because experienced administrators ... were seeing differently, more keenly, more astutely.”  
*(Delivering on the Promise, The New Foundation Press Inc, and Kennnewick, WA. 2004. Page 72.)*

**Data Points:** In order to measure the projects achievements, data points will be gathered. CRT data will be used as a baseline for school and student performance. Additional CRT data will be added at the end of each year. UTIPS will be used at the first of each year to give a “snapshot” of the student achievement. Subsequent UTIPS assessments will be given to check progress throughout the year. Walk’bout data will be collected in an ongoing assessment of teaching strategies. Administrators will be given follow-up surveys to ensure data-driven-decision-making strategies are being used. Each school will receive at least two visits each year for an evaluation of compliance. Rubrics will be provided to all participants at the onset of the grant and reviewed often.

### Action Plan

Professional Development Activity	Staffing	Resources	Schedule	Facilities	Timeframes
Provide Leaders with book “ <u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> ”	Regional Staff	<u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> book	May 19, 2005	NA	NA
Vision Development Review “ <u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> ” Walk’bout Training	Susan Brooks-Young, Walk’bout trainers, Regional staff	<u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> book, Palm, Walk’bout software, Jordan School District training materials	July 11-14, 2005	Southern Utah University (Hunter Conference Center)	24 hours
UTIPS Training	UTIPS Trainers, Cody Spendlove, Amy Roundy	UTIPS, Laptop,	Aug. 2, 2005	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Leaders visit schools successfully using Walk’bout	Cohort Mentors, Walk’bout trainers	Palms, laptops	September 22-23, 2005	Chino-Valley Unified School District	12 hours
Data-Driven-Decision-Making	Reeves trained staff, Glen Taylor, James Christensen, Amy Roundy	Data-Driven-Decision-Making (Reeves)	October 20-21, 2005	Sevier Training Center	12 hours
Revisit Walk’bout training including Marzano’s strategies	Susan Brooks-Young, Walk’bout trainers	Palm, Walk’bout software, <u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> book	November 14, 2005	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Evaluation visit to each school	Cohort mentors with executive committee	Evaluation Rubric	December 12-16, 2005	NA	2 hours per school
Leaders visit school using Data-Driven-Decision-Making to differentiate instruction	Cohort Mentors, Walk’bout trainers	Palms, laptops	January 19-20, 2006	Provo School District	12 hours
Review of disaggregated data before NCLB testing	Regional Data Specialist. Susan Brooks-Young, Data driven decision trainers	Laptops	March 6, 2006	Sevier Training Center	6 hours

Cohort visit each others schools	Cohort mentors	Evaluation rubric	April 3-4, 2006	NA	2 hours per school
Evaluation and re-tooling of grant	Harvey Barnett, Susan Brooks-Young, Executive committee, Regional trainers	Evaluation results	June 6, 2006	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Training on new UTIPS data disaggregation system	Regional Trainers, Data Specialist	NCLB test results, disaggregation tool, laptops	July 10-13, 2006	Southern Utah University (Hunter Conference Center)	24 hours
Leaders visit to school. Power Standards, Data-Driven-Decision-Making	Cohort mentors, regional trainers	Laptops, palm, <u>Making Power Standards Work</u> book	September 14-15, 2006	Anderson School District Five	12 hours
Disaggregation training	Data specialist, regional trainers	Laptops,	October 16, 2006	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Sub-group strategies and differentiated instruction methods	Susan Brooks-Young	Laptops	November 13, 2006	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Evaluations of school	Cohort mentors with executive committee	Evaluation rubric	December 11-12, 2007	NA	2 hours per school
Leaders visit to school. Differentiated instruction	Cohort mentors, regional trainers	Laptops, palm, <u>Classroom Instruction that Works</u> book	January 19-20, 2007	Jordan School District	12 hours
Differentiated instructional strategies	Training specialist	Web resources	February 6, 2007	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Review of disaggregated data before NCLB testing	Regional Data Specialist. Susan Brooks-Young,	Laptops	March 6, 2006	Sevier Training Center	6 hours
Celebration of success and revision	All participants	Laptops, school data,	June 8, 2007	Southern Utah University	6 hours
Monthly Cohort online meeting	All Participants, Cohort mentors	IVC (IP Video Conferencing) Laptops	July 2005 – June 2007	NA	1 hour per meeting

Goals	Hardware	Relationship to goal
Improve academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools	Palm device, laptop	Data collection, teaching strategies for differentiated learning, data disaggregation, presentation, communication with cohorts/ mentors
Assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – to increase his or her academic achievement by using technology to enhance differentiated instruction	UTIPS, existing hardware within buildings	Tools for students that increase academic achievement, student technology literacy. Differentiated instruction (i.e. Talking text, digital text, word features, enhanced text, graphic organizers, and portable devices), using existing equipment within buildings.
Encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum enhancement to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.	Palm device, laptop	Walk'bout, research based, sync with palm, reporting from walk'bout, using filemaker pro database, UTIPS reporting

**Partnerships:** Articulate the breadth of partners involved in the project. Partnerships can be with other LEAs, Higher Ed. Institutions, libraries, and/or other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.

The partnerships for this project consist of seven rural school districts in central Utah, Snow College Richfield, two regional service centers, a Utah Correctional Facility and an urban school district. The rural school districts range in student population from under 300 to over 4,000. The rurality index for these varies from 7 to 1 as indicated in the Utah School Locales Codes. The rural school districts are Juab School District, North Sanpete School District, Piute School District, Sevier School District, South Sanpete School District, Tintic School Districts and Wayne School District. The Urban District is Jordan School District with a student population of over 73,000.

Central Utah Education Services (CUES) and Southeast Education Service Center (SESC) are regional centers that will add support for this project. Specifically CUES will provide follow-up training on the Data-Driven-Decision-Making model, the use of the Walk'bout software, and training in the instructional process. CUES will also lead the districts in developing and continually supporting a data-disaggregation system that is both user-friendly and able to deliver data in a timely manner.

SESC did the original programming for the UTIPS test generator and will provide ongoing technical support and the expertise to “tweak” the system to meet the needs of schools using data-driven instructional model. Snow College Richfield will provide programming expertise for the web-based interfaces. Rural district professional development resources will be leveraged by inviting all stake-holders (personnel and students) who are members of the consortium to pertinent inservice activities. The districts have technology specialists that will provide expertise to load software and keep the technology tool functioning properly. Jordan School District will provide consulting on differentiated instruction and will collaborate on leveraging professional development opportunities for the rural teachers

Partnerships are successful only if each participant benefits from the partnership. Each entity adds assets, educational capital and human resources to the project. These partnerships result in the educational enhancement of all students in each of districts.

**Form 4 – Budget Form** (up to 2 pages narrative)

Please complete the budget distribution table, the narrative, and a separate USOE Budget form.

**BUDGET DISTRIBUTION TABLE – Do not include the amounts expected from this grant.**

LEA	EETT formula funds	Other NCLB funds	LEA matching funds	Other matching funds	LEA in-kind match
Juab District	\$ 4,824	\$ 1,000	\$27,984	\$	\$ 2,500
North Sanpete District	\$10,153	\$ 1,000	\$36,646		\$ 2,500
Piute District	\$2,103	\$ 1,000	\$23,458		\$ 2,500
Sevier District	\$21,124	\$ 1,000	\$58,466		\$12,500
South Sanpete District	\$13,626	\$ 1,000	\$36,646		\$ 2,500
Tintic District	\$1,262	\$ 1,000	\$23,458		\$ 2,500
Wayne District	\$3,269	\$ 1,000	\$23,458		\$ 2,500

## Matching funds for AWED Grant

Grant Funds Yr 1		Matching Funds Yr 1		Grant Funds Yr 2		Matching Funds Yr 2	
Salaries & Benefits	\$0.00	\$317,234.00		Salaries & Benefits	\$0.00	\$317,234.00	
Purchase Service	\$88,500.00			Purchase Service	\$67,500.00		
Purchase Property	\$0.00			Purchase Property	\$0.00		
Other Purchase	\$40,000.00	\$10,000.00		Other Purchase	\$74,200.00	\$10,000.00	
Travel	\$118,090.00	\$57,232.00		Travel	\$129,290.00	\$57,232.00	
Supplies Material	\$18,387.00	\$16,450.00		Supplies Material	\$5,300.00	\$16,450.00	
Other Objects	\$0.00			Other Objects	\$0.00		
Other	\$23,703.00			Other	\$16,590.00		
Property	\$129,780.00			Property	\$0.00		
EETT		\$74,361.00		EETT		\$74,361.00	
NCLB		\$8,000.00		NCLB		\$8,000.00	
Total	\$418,460.00	\$483,277.00	115.49%	Total	\$292,880.00	\$483,277.00	165.01%

Narrative explaining the overall budget: (Please also articulate how grant monies support the grant goals.)

The total two-year budget including matching money from partners is \$1,677,894.00. The total two-year grant is \$711,340. The matching money is 136% of the grant money. All of this money will be used to accomplish three goals: (1) Improve academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools, (2) assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – to increase his or her academic achievement by using technology to enhance instruction, and (3) encourage effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum enhancement to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

Goal (1) will require the book Classroom Instruction that Works • \$3,477, training in the book and vision development • \$4,000, Walk’bout training • \$25,380, Filemaker Pro and Walk’bout software • \$11,910, Leaders will visit schools using Walk’bout software successfully to glean techniques and teacher strategy identification • \$118,090, Training on newly developed data disaggregation tool which will require UTIPS programming • \$32,500

Goal (2) will require UTIPS programming which is included in goal (1), differentiated instruction which includes students using talking text, digital text, word features, enhanced text, graphic organizers, and portable devices which insures students are learning through their being technologically literate • \$8,000.

Goal (3) will require a laptop used to sync Walk'bout software, to implement Marzano strategies, make presentations to teachers, and create reports • \$104,400, visit to each school for observation of Administrator's use of Walk'bout software by cohort mentors and project staff • \$30,000, Leaders visit schools successfully using Data-Driven-Decision-Making • \$118,090, Publish project findings and encourage participants to present these findings at Utah Rural School Conference, NECC, and UCET • \$11,200

Other expenses which relate to each goal are per diem, in-state travel, printed materials and consumables, audit of project, meeting facilities • \$124,000, project director for two years • \$80,000, evaluation of the project including data collection • \$40,293.

*Please also supply a USOE Budget form detailing the EETT grant fund expenditure categories and amounts. The Budget form is available at:*

<http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/curr/nclb/xls/NCLBbudgtemp.xls>

## Appendix A

List of participating school(s) by LEA, Title I poverty percentage, rationale for selection, and number of teachers to receive professional development.

LEA	School	Title I poverty percentage	Rationale for selection	Number of teachers to receive PD
Juab School District	Mona Elementary School	53.72 %	School is high poverty	1
Juab School District	Nephi Elementary School	39.60%	School is high poverty	1
Juab School District	Juab 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Center	40.03%	School is high poverty	1
Juab School District	Juab 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade center	40.03%	School is high poverty	1
Juab School District	Juab High School	31.20%	School is technology deficient	2
North Sanpete School District	Fairview Elementary School	49.78%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	Fountain Green Elementary School	54.35%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	Moroni Elementary School	70.64%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	Mt. Pleasant Elementary School	57.51%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	Spring City Elementary School	53.78%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	North Sanpete Middle School	54.22%	School is high poverty	1
North Sanpete School District	North Sanpete High School	46.92%	School is high poverty	2
Piute School District	Circleville Elementary School	80.52%	School is high poverty	1
Piute School District	Oscar son Elementary School	72.73%	School is high poverty	1
Piute School District	Piute High School	51.80%	School is high poverty	2
Sevier School District	Ashman Elementary	44.44%	School is high poverty	1

	School			
Sevier School District	Koosharem Elementary School	65.22%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	Cedar Ridge High School	74.52%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	Monroe Elementary School	62.59%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	Pahvant Elementary School	47.10%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	Salina Elementary School	47.43%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	North Sevier Middle School	41.53%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	Red Hills Middle School	43.79%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	South Sevier Middle School	49.30%	School is high poverty	1
Sevier School District	North Sevier High School	30.29%	School is technology deficient	1
Sevier School District	Richfield High School	34.14%	School is high poverty	2
Sevier School District	South Sevier High School	41.60%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Ephraim Elementary School	64.74%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Gunnison Valley Elementary School	70.05%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Manti Elementary School	46.92%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Ephraim Middle School	46.25%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Gunnison Valley Middle School	56.63%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Gunnison Valley High School	39.32%	School is high poverty	1
South Sanpete School District	Manti High School	36.61%	School is high poverty	2
South Sanpete School District	Sanpete Academy	75.44%	School is high poverty	1

South Sanpete School District	Central Utah Correctional Facility	NA	Adult literacy school	1
Tintic School District	Callao School	100%	School is high poverty	1
Tintic School District	Eureka Elementary School	84.34%	School is high poverty	1
Tintic School District	Tintic High School	42.98%	School is high poverty	2
Tintic School District	West Desert School	100%	School is high poverty	1
Wayne School District	Hanksville Elementary School	87.10%	School is high poverty	1
Wayne School District	Loa Elementary School	49.76%	School is high poverty	1
Wayne School District	Wayne Middle School	56.03%	School is high poverty	1
Wayne School District	Wayne High School	53.95%	School is high poverty	2

State Average 32.37

---

## Appendix B

Letters of commitment from grant partners:

---

## Appendix C

100% of EETT flow-through funds used for integrating technology verified by copy of Title II Part D budget for each LEA:

---

The application must be submitted no later than midnight on January 31, 2005, to both program contacts via e-mail. (Coversheet and letters may be attached as PDFs or be faxed.)

### Program Contacts:

Rick Gaisford - (801) 538-7798 USOE Educational Technology Specialist - FAX: 801-538-7769  
[rgaisfor@usoe.k12.ut.us](mailto:rgaisfor@usoe.k12.ut.us)

Kathleen Webb - (435)586-6160 USOE Online Tools Specialist [webb\\_k@suu.edu](mailto:webb_k@suu.edu)